

Amendment/Reply

Applicant: Ulrich Hachmann et al.

Serial No.: 10/592,925

Filed: August 26, 2008

Docket No.: I432.135.101/P33804

Title: COMPUTER SYSTEM FOR ELECTRONIC DATA PROCESSING

REMARKS

This Amendment/Reply accompanies the Request for Continued Examination (RCE) 37 CFR 1.114 and is in reply to the Final Office Action mailed November 8, 2010. Claims 11 and 20 have been cancelled. Claims 10, 11, 13-20, and 22-29 were rejected. With this Response, claims 10, 13, 19, and 24 have been amended. Claims 10, 13-19 and 22-29 remain pending in the application and are presented for reconsideration and allowance.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner rejected claims 10-11, 13-20, and 22-29 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by the Houg U.S. Patent No. 6,055,597. This reference, however, does not teach or suggest the amended claims.

As amended, claim 10 is a computer system having a first data processing unit, a second data processing unit, and a data transmission memory device providing parameter transmission from the first data processing unit to the second data processing unit. The data transmission memory device includes a first memory region with a set of records and a second memory region with a set of records correlated with the first memory region's set of records. A records transmission process includes determining when the first memory region is available to be overwritten with subsequent data, *determining which records in a subsequent record set differ from a current record set stored in the first memory region, overwriting a current record in the current record set if it is determined that the current record's counterpart in the subsequent record set is different than the current record*, determining when the second data processing unit is ready to process a new set of records; and copying the parameter set in the first memory region into the second memory region. This is not taught or suggested.

As best understood by Applicant, the Examiner has essentially argued that one of ordinary skill has no motivation to replicate the data already in the buffer, since that wastes system resources. While Applicant appreciates the Examiner's observation, they respectfully note that avoiding such replication and any attendant waste is precisely the problem which the subject matter of the present application seeks to solve. In this sense, the Examiner's observation merely restates the problem.

Amendment/Reply

Applicant: Ulrich Hachmann et al.

Serial No.: 10/592,925

Filed: August 26, 2008

Docket No.: I432.135.101/P33804

Title: COMPUTER SYSTEM FOR ELECTRONIC DATA PROCESSING

The claim set has been amended to clearly address the difference between the problem – wasting system resources by blindly replicating data – and avoiding that problem by employing the presently claimed subject matter. In particular, determining which records in a subsequent record set differ from a current record set stored in the first memory region prior to overwriting a current record in the current record set. As such, elements “determining which records in a subsequent record set differ from a current record set stored in the first memory region” and “overwriting a current record in the current record set if it is determined that the current record’s counterpart in the subsequent record set is different than the current record” are not found in the Houg patent, and thus the Houg patent does not teach or suggest the claimed subject matter.

For the reasons above, the Houg patent does not anticipate claim 10 and for the same reasons does not anticipate claims 19 and 24 which recite similar elements. Further, claims, 13-18, 22-23 and 25-29 all depend directly or indirectly from independent claims 10, 19 or 24. They are therefore believed to be patentable over the Houg patent for at least the same reasons as discussed above. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection of claims 10, 13-19 and 22-29 in view of the Houg patent be withdrawn, and requests allowance of these claims.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejected claims 13, 15, 17-18, 25, 27, and 29 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Houg U.S. Patent No. 6,055,597. Since these remaining claims all depend directly or indirectly from independent claims 10, 19 or 24, considered by Applicant to be allowable for the reasons stated above, claims 13, 15, 17, 18, 25, 27 and 29 are therefore also believed to be patentable as non-obvious over the Houg patent for at least the same reasons. In particular, the Houg patent does not disclose a “determining which records in a subsequent record set differ from a current record set stored in the first memory region” and a subsequent conditional overwrite of records depending upon the outcome of the determination. As nothing in the Examiner’s stated view of contemporary computer system components/design meet at least the missing elements, there appears to be no basis for a rejection of the claims under 103(a).

Amendment/Reply

Applicant: Ulrich Hachmann et al.

Serial No.: 10/592,925

Filed: August 26, 2008

Docket No.: I432.135.101/P33804

Title: COMPUTER SYSTEM FOR ELECTRONIC DATA PROCESSING

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection to the claims, and requests allowance of these claims.

Amendment/Reply

Applicant: Ulrich Hachmann et al.

Serial No.: 10/592,925

Filed: August 26, 2008

Docket No.: I432.135.101/P33804

Title: COMPUTER SYSTEM FOR ELECTRONIC DATA PROCESSING

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that pending claims 10, 13-19 and 22-29 are in form for allowance and are not taught or suggested by the cited references. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of claims 10, 13-19 and 22-29 are respectfully requested.

No fees are required under 37 C.F.R. 1.16(h)(i). However, if such fees are required, the Patent Office is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 50-0471.

Please consider this a Petition for Extension of Time for a sufficient number of months to enter these papers, if appropriate. At any time during the pendency of this application, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 500471.

The Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's representative at the below-listed telephone numbers to facilitate prosecution of this application.

Any inquiry regarding this Amendment and Response should be directed to Paul P. Kempf at Telephone No. (612) 767-2502, Facsimile No. (612) 573-2005. In addition, all correspondence should continue to be directed to the following address:

Dicke, Billig & Czaja
Fifth Street Towers, Suite 2250
100 South Fifth Street
Minneapolis, MN 55402

Respectfully submitted,

Ulrich Hachmann et al.,

By their attorneys,

DICKE, BILLIG & CZAJA, PLLC
Fifth Street Towers, Suite 2250
100 South Fifth Street
Minneapolis, MN 55402
Telephone: (612) 767-2502
Facsimile: (612) 573-2005

Date: March 8, 2011
PPK:cmj:mlm

/paulkempf/
Paul P. Kempf
Reg. No. 39,727